R E M A R K S

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8 – 10, 15, and 16 are in the application. Claims 1, 15, and 16 are currently amended; claims 2, 4, 5, and 8 – 10 were previously presented; and claims 3, 6, 7, 11 – 14, 17, and 18 are canceled Claims 1, 15, and 16 are the independent claims herein.

No new matter has been added to the application as a result of the amendments submitted herewith.

Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8 – 10, 15, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph for allegedly containing subject matter that was not described in the Specification in a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time of the invention, had possession of the claimed invention. In particular, the Final Office Action (FOA) stated that Applicant's claimed, "wherein the security risk associated with the one or more of the first or second elements is also specifically associated with the corresponding hierarchical level of the one or more of the first or second elements" is not supported by the Specification.

In reply thereto, claims 1, 15, and 16 are currently amended to overcome the rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph. For example, claim 1 now recites "receiving into the computer storage, on a real time basis, an indication of a security risk, wherein the indication of a security risk comprises at least one of: a potential for physical, reputational, economic or legal harm and is received from government agency or a news feed". Claims 15 and 16 are amended similar to claim 1. Applicant submits that support for the current amendments to claims 1, 15, and 16 is provided in the Specification at page 6, lines 14 – 25.

Applicant submits that all of the claimed subject matter is in compliance with 35 USC 112, first paragraph. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8 – 10, 15, and 16 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8 – 10, 15, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beverina et al. U.S. Publication No. 2001/0027388 in view of Zimmers et al. U.S. Publication No. 2005/0013417. This rejection is traversed.

Applicant notes that claim 1 is amended to relate to a computer implemented method for managing security risk. The claimed method includes setting, in a computer storage, a hierarchical relationship between multiple elements comprising an entity wherein a first element of a first hierarchical level comprises a physical facility and other of the multiple elements each have a hierarchical level subordinate to the first element and comprises one of a facility, a resource, and an asset located at the physical facility of the first element; receiving into the computer storage, on a real time basis, an indication of a security risk, wherein the indication of a security risk comprises at least one of: a potential for physical, reputational, economic or legal harm and is received from government agency or a news feed; receiving into the computer storage an indication of a first selection of one of the first or the other multiple elements; associating the received indication of a security risk with the first selected element such that the hierarchical level of the first selected element is related to certain aspects of the received indication of security risk; and transmitting via a computer processor coupled to a communication network apparatus, a description of the security risk as it relates to the first selected element, wherein the relationship between the received indication of a security risk and the first selected element is based upon the hierarchical relationship of the first and the other of the multiple elements and the indication of the security risk associated with the corresponding hierarchical levels of the first and the second other

10

elements. The claimed method further includes receiving into the computer storage an indication of a second selection of one of the first or the other of the multiple elements, wherein the second selection is different than the first selection; associating the received indication of a security risk to the second selected element such that the hierarchical level of the second selected element is related to certain aspects of the received indication of security risk; transmitting via the computer processor coupled to a communication network apparatus, a description of the security risk as it relates to the second selected element, wherein the relationship between the received indication of a security risk and the second selected element is based upon the hierarchical relationship of the first and the other of the multiple elements and the indication of the security risk, thereby providing a mechanism for a user to traverse between the first and the other of the multiple elements based on the hierarchical relationship between the multiple elements and be presented with the aspects of the security risk associated with the first and the other of the multiple elements and their hierarchical level.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 15 and 16 are worded similar to claim 1.

Applicant further submits that the cited and relied upon combination of Beverina and Zimmers fails to disclose, suggest, or otherwise render claims 1, 15, and 16 obvious under 35 USC 103(a). Applicant notes that the subject claims relate to a hierarchical relationship between multiple elements comprising an entity, associating the received indication of a security risk with the first selected element such that the hierarchical level of the first selected element is related to certain aspects of the received indication of security risk; transmitting a description of the security risk as it relates to the first selected element, wherein the relationship between the received indication of a security risk and the first selected element is based upon the hierarchical relationship of the first and the other of the multiple elements and the indication of the security risk associated with the corresponding hierarchical levels of the first and the second other elements; associating the received indication of a security risk to the second selected element such that the hierarchical level of the second selected element

is related to certain aspects of the received indication of security risk; and transmitting via the computer processor coupled to a communication network apparatus, a description of the security risk as it relates to the second selected element, wherein the relationship between the received indication of a security risk and the second selected element is based upon the hierarchical relationship of the first and the other of the multiple elements and the indication of the security risk, thereby providing a mechanism for a user to traverse between the first and the other of the multiple elements based on the hierarchical relationship between the multiple elements and be presented with the aspects of the security risk associated with the first and the other of the multiple elements and their hierarchical level.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited and relied upon Beverina/Zimmers combination fails to disclose the claimed hierarchical relationship between a first element and other of the multiple elements, including the association of the selected first and other multiple elements forming the basis of the hierarchical relationship between the first and multiple elements, as claimed. Instead, Beverina/Zimmers, and in particular Beverina, appears to relate to, at most, a first and a second hierarchical level. For example, Beverina is cited and relied upon for disclosing a building and a floor within that building. Contrary to Beverina, Applicant's claims relate to multiple elements where each element is associated with its own hierarchical level and a security risk is further associated with the each element.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 103(a). Claims 2 and 4, 5, and 8 – 10 depend from claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2, and 4, 5, and 8 – 10 are patentable over Beverina and Zimmers for at least depending from an allowable base claim, and claims 15 and 16 are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

C O N C L U S I O N

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-5985.

Respectfully submitted,

January 21, 2009
Date

/Randolph P. Calhoune/
Randolph P. Calhoune
Registration No. 45,371
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC
50 Locust Avenue
New Canaan, CT 06840
(203) 972-5985